

REMARKS

Prior to further examination of the present application, applicant respectfully requests entry of this Submission. Claims 1-25 were pending in the application. New claims 26-36 have been added while none of the existing claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-36 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the final Office Action dated October 17, 2002, claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,081,262 issued to Gill et al. ("Gill"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As recited in each of the independent claims, the claimed invention solves the problem of having a user manually generate a sequence of commands for controlling a graphics engine to generate an on-air graphics page for broadcast, for example, in a television broadcast system.

In order to automate this process, the new independent claims 26 and 33 recite:

- a) a template data element, the template data element including a graphics component and a data field component suitable for receiving an information unit;
- b) a processor for processing the template data element and an information unit source to enter in the data field component of a selected information unit to form a representation of a graphics page that results from a combination of the template data element and the selected information unit;
- c) a database that associates said components to commands from said graphics engine command set;
- d) command generator scripts for mapping said components in said representation of a graphics page to commands from said graphics engine command set, to generate said sequence of commands; and

e) an output coupled to said processor for outputting said sequence of commands to said graphics engine. These features and those recited in the pending independent claims 1, 11, and 18 are not disclosed or suggested by Gill.

Specifically, Gill describes a multimedia presentation system, known commercially as the QuarkImmedia product. This system is comprised of two components, a multimedia project and a viewer. The system is based on the page based document layout of the QuarkExpress system with the addition of a multi-media authoring tool to extend the capabilities of the QuarkExpress page based document layout system. See col. 3, line 36 of Gill. The authoring tool enables an author to merge both static and dynamic objects in the familiar Quarkexpress page based layout environment to create the multimedia presentation. See col. 3, line 56-65 of Gill.

The presentation is then exported as a run-time display which is a **non editable object** (col. 17, lines 10-12 of Gill) and must be viewed by a viewer V process. Specifically, Gill teaches that the presentations must be “retrieved from [the] presentation files and transmitted to the display device.... a viewer process V is either available to the user separate from accessing of the presentation or it is embedded in the presentation or downloaded concurrently therewith.” See col. 18, line 1-6 of Gill.

In fact, all pages of the exported presentation are rasterized, thus each page is essentially a graphic as described by Gill (col. 13, lines 38-43). That is, the multi-media authoring tool A automatically rasterizes the composite static elements of the multi-media presentation page to create a bit mapped display and then separately rasterizes each of the dynamic images.

The features recited in the pending independent claims differ from the disclosure of Gill for at least the following two reasons.

First, the features recited in pending independent claims do not rasterize the graphics pages before transmission to the graphic engine. That is, in sharp contrast to Gill, each of these claims recite generating and transmitting a sequence of commands to a graphics engine.

As discussed above, the multi-media authoring tool A of Gill automatically creates different representations for exporting multi-media presentations that are created by the author as a function of the characteristics of the destination storage/presentation medium.

These exported multi-media presentations are non-editable files, which are used by the user activating a viewer V to manage and view the multi-media presentation and do not correspond to the recited output of a set of commands to a graphics engine.

Second, each of the independent claims recite that the transmitted set of commands are executed by the graphics engine to create an on-air graphics page for display in a broadcast system. As discussed earlier, Gill teaches that the multimedia presentations contain rasterized data that are presented by the viewer and therefore therefore Gill does not teach or suggest the claimed graphics engine that creates an on air graphics page for display based on a received set of commands as recited in the pending independent claims.

Therefore, Gill does not teach or suggest controlling a graphics engine by providing a sequence of command to be executed by the graphics engine to create a graphics page for display. In fact, Gill exports a non-editable file containing rasterized data this is clearly not a sequence of commands as required by the pending claims.

Gill's system has the disadvantage that it requires a specific viewer process in order to view or interact with the presentation, clearly such a viewer process would be impractical if not unusable in a television production and broadcast environment. Accordingly, Gill does not teach either the specific claimed features or the advantages of the claimed features in the pending independent claims.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that pending independent claims 1, 11, 18, 26, and 33 are patentable over Gill. Furthermore, the dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite features that are also patentable when considered as a whole.

In view of the above, applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 17, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5416

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

Brian J. McNamara

Registration No. 32,789

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicant